

M 1115

Sunday, January 15, 1967

Berkeley Groups I and II and Palo Alto Group II

Now, where are we going to start? Plans - how are we going to - I'll be here about two weeks, you know, maybe just a little over, Monday; Tuesday I think I will go to Santa Fe. Well, Saturday I have to go to Seattle to be in Portland in the evening, I think, not during the afternoon. I think that evening they should come to Seattle very late and then get up next morning quite early. Anyhow, we'll be there Monday; Tuesday I'm coming back, so Monday evening I won't be here. Otherwise, my time is yours. So you do what you now you want me to do I'll do it. Because I come here for you, of course, and to talk about work. I have a feeling, you know, that even when I get tapes and I listen to them sometimes, make notes and send it, or sometimes a little tape in response - it's rather difficult. In the first place you get a week if the mail is any good and if I'm any good you get it a week later. By that time you've forgotten certain things. Then for me to repeat what you have said may bring it back - it's a little time consuming but usually I would not say it in the words you have said it. Sometimes the question that I hear I may not have understood at - sometimes I go off on a tangent in answering it. And, of course, there is no reply to that because that would make it much too complicated because I would have to give an answer again to another answer, et cetera, et cetera, and it's nonsense. The difficulties that I labor under is when I hear it, you can not explain things. But when we talk we have a chance to do a little reparté probably and to catch the expression on person's face or he will be able by means of smiling and a little pause apply in talking you introduce a

different kind of an element. And of course there is nothing that can be compared to a personal relationship. So at best it is rather poor substitute, and still I think it is necessary because it shows that I am not only interested in but that maybe sometimes certain things can be caught or perhaps explained a little better or maybe certain things can be set right. But you must also know that it is so second hand, and that whenever there may be a certain misunderstanding, that it creeps in without, without being able to change it, and therefore when we now have two weeks we ought to concentrate as much as ^{we} possibly can on talking about work, how, and what, and the obstacles, the different things that you have encountered, and that you in response try to see me as often as you can or wish, that we have as many meetings that we really can get together and that we can really talk, so that at the end of two weeks that you can say it has been a little hard and heavy and time-consuming but I hope that it's worth while. Now, the tentative plan - Ron...

Ron (Chamberlain): Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Was Tuesday - I left out Monday, I think -

Ron: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: But Tuesday we would meet here.

Ron: Regular Group II meeting here.

Mr. Nyland: And then Wednesday in Palo Alto. That I think was announced at the meeting on last - Number 8 Palo Alto, you talked about it and it was alright. Can people come on the Wednesday then without too much trouble? I was afraid with school work and so forth maybe someone couldn't make it. And it's all right. Now, on your, you mentioned also about people from Palo Alto if they wanted to come to Tuesday - of course they can. And Berkeley people can go to Palo Alto on Wednesday if they want to. Thursday,

~~what are our plans on Saturday?~~

Ron: Thursday is our regular Group I meeting here.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah, good, then everyone comes of Group I from Palo Alto also here. All right. Friday, music. Did you arrange it?

Ron: I haven't arranged it yet but I think it's -

Mr. Nyland: A good chance?

Ron: Very good chance, yes.

Mr. Nyland: So that will be a little music then at the University. Same place?

Ron: Same place, I hope, yes.

Mr. Nyland: Well, good. Saturday then I'll be gone. I'll be back Tuesday morning. Then Tuesday evening open group, huh. Here? Berkeley?

Ron: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: All right. I hope you know what you're doing. Yeah, you know open groups are very good but then supposing you arouse sufficient interest. And then they come. It, it is a responsibility on the part of the older people. And you have to answer because they come, their interests happen to be there. And I think it is double responsibility really because if you don't answer it right or do not keep up the enthusiasm of course you lose them. I think that was a little difficulty in Palo Alto, wasn't there? How many did we save out of the numbers? Two, no?

Ron: No, I think more than that.

Mr. Nyland: More than that? Now wait a minute, three and then a new one came recently with George, there was another one that came with George, George Block.

Don Andrews: And Steve brought someone.

Mr. Nyland: But that was a new one. And, oh, then there was Jill. She was new, on the last one, huh? Who is Jill?

Art Andrews: He's here, sir.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, and then Ned, no Fred. Fred Medrong. Then we can afford two open meetings. One in Berkeley, and one in Palo Alto on Wednesday. All right? Thursday again here, Group general resume, see how far we are. Friday, again a little music.

Ron: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Saturday. What will we do on Saturday? We have to do something, don't we?

John Booker: We could have a picnic.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah, that's what I thought. If it's good weather. Maybe some skiing. All right, still far enough away but we can plan for it. And also Sunday. And then there is Monday. General rehash. Tuesday I'll be gone. All right, now is that plan agreeable? Who has any other ideas or new suggestions or -

Linda Adams: Movements.

Mr. Nyland: Huh?

Linda: Movements.

Mr. Nyland: Movements we have to fit in. Yeah, we'll have to talk about that, right, Steve, huh? Ist obligatories, who plays them?

Steve Joseph: I can play them.

Mr. Nyland: Good.

Steve Joseph: And I haven't spoken with Doug. I don't know whether he can or not.

Mr. Nyland: Uh huh, all right. I would like to hear them. Where? Where are we going to have movements? This piano is going to be tuned? Huh?

Ron: It will be tuned on Thursday.

Mr. Nyland: So maybe for a limited number. Highly select, huh? Who?

Linda: We could draw straws.

Mr. Nyland: No no no no NO NO. Then you get into trouble. No it has to be selected by a select committee, AND who will nominate the members of that committee? Huh? Well, I think John, uh, Ron we better get together on that and see how to solve it. But if the music is good we ought to have them, shall we? At least do some work on it. All right. Now any other plans that might come up during the time- Let's talk it over. Now, work. Special kinds of problems, subjects. Who is listening to tapes now? More or less regularly? How are the resumes of when I was here last time?

Pat Booker: Coming along slowly.

Mr. Nyland: How slowly?

Pat: Oh, too slowly.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah, I think so too, Can we do anything? Speed it up?

Pat: We can put a time limit on it.

Mr. Nyland: Let's talk it over Patricia. I think more should be done. But of course all of you are professional, makes it very difficult, doesn't it? What will we talk about?

Ron: I would like it if you could say something about the way in which work - as we talk about it in our meetings - is expressed differently by different people but often times the actual experience may be the same or very nearly the same. It's something that comes up and I think that we could use some clarification.

Mr. Nyland: I think that there is always two different things that you have to keep in mind. The use of words and correct use, and then when one describes it in the formulation of each person depends on his experience. I think that if it is boiled down to a very simple way, then you ought to have a language that is the same. I don't think that by this time there should be any difference in the definition of what is meant by work,

objectivity, impartiality, identification, simultaneity, and so forth. I think that that ought to be quite clear. And when one talks about A B C that it is clearly understood what is meant. And that each person in that way should use the same kind of words and also be understood. Never to use the particular things that they feel is similarly expressed - If it is similar then they can use the same. I think that there is many times there is the tendency of wanting to express certain things that seem to be the same and then use the word that doesn't really mean it and doesn't cover. Who has difficulty in defining what is impartiality? Who can give a definition? Charles McDermid: I'd like to try. I believe it's not dealing with an idea or a feeling, having no feeling which describes the experience nor any idea that describes it, that the mind is somehow not involved in the observation nor is one's feeling of it good or bad.

Mr. Nyland: Well, it is an impartial fact, isn't it? Or an impartial statement. So it has to do with a description, not with the observation. Observation will give you a fact, and a certain interpretation of it should be impartial. So, it should be a fact by itself without, as you say, any particular embellishment, either coming from one's feelings or from the mind. I prefer to consider the impartiality more relating to the feeling than to a description of the mind. You see, so I leave that idea off - I make it simply that I don't want to have a like or a dislike of any kind of a description that has to do with a statement of feeling which would ~~have~~ adhere to a statement of fact. Whenever I want to exclude the mind, I would like to use the word simultaneity for it, because, in simultaneity there is a moment which then, because of that kind of a definition, will exclude the functions of the mental, of the mind as we know it in the form of thinking, and the thinking as dependent then on anticipation of the future and memory of the past, which is quite different of course from the moment, and therefore

then I exclude all possibilities of a mental thought which might describe it, or categorize it, or put it in a pigeon hole, or things of that kind. So the three things: The observation by itself has to be an impartial one and impartiality if it is understood correctly has to be at the moment because only then can I be sure that the moment actually will give me the facts the way it has to be. So in that way you might say that impartiality will link up the idea but you have to get the impartiality then down to the momentary recording, and then I prefer the word simultaneity or instantaneousness or living in a moment or recording in a moment, whatever it may be. Now, do, do, do we all agree now with that? Because what Charles says is right you see, it is a correct definition. Now, differing from impartiality, what is identification? And when we say non-identification? In partiality, you can say you become part of that which is a fact. And impartiality would be that there is no part of you attached to the fact. Identification is something that is also belonging to yourself which goes out to that which is being observed. And it is then as if part of yourself is attached to that which you are describing. And you become then identified with that outside object as if also it is part of you, although it is not sharply defined what particular part of you is identified with the object. It may be you feeling and it may also be your mind. So non-identification of course is the opposite of that, the negation so that nothing of that kind exists and no part goes out from you to the outside - that what is being observed - and that therefore that what is the object stands on its own. So it excludes all forms of one's ordinary personality which have to do with any kind of a description, either mental or feeling, feelingly, or sometimes emotional. OBJECTIVITY: What is it? We use it of course in distinction or comparing with subjectivity. And because Objectivity is probably difficult to define - Did you put your hand up? - it's difficult

to define, you get around it by saying everything that is non-subjective becomes Objective. That's really begging the question, but then you would have to define what is subjective, and that means of course that all forms belonging to any one of the centers of man as we know him in an unconscious state are of course subjective expressions of him. So all manifestations of one's personality become subjective, that includes, of course, all thinking processes regardless of what they are - formulation or pondering, considering, also where the mind sometimes goes over into a little feeling and then the feelings per se, that what I like and dislike, description of any kind, a description of the condition of the kind of an object, cold or hot or whatever the sense organs would give and in general everything that reaches one's mind by means of the sense organs, which of course give immediately in the mind by recognizing what already has gone on before that I become, that I identify, that I define that what is being sensed, sense now, sensing now in the sense of a sense organ registering whatever has to be registered. So that if everything that is subjective of our world of that what we are, what we are doing, and the way we behave, everything we are as personality becomes then subjective. Now objective by definition should be completely free from any form of subjective. So it means that whenever we think, which is already subjective, that everything we think about anything is also a subjective description or an identification or a definition in some form or other. If we feel, again that feeling is of course a subjective operation of the personality and again it would be very difficult to have this feeling in an objective sense because feeling itself is subjective. If the instrument is subjective, that what is the result that I get from the instrument must be subjective. So in order to get a concept of objectivity I have to have something that is not dependent on feeling or thinking...that would mean a body. But the body ~~an~~ itself

also has certain feelings or certain wishes or certain even a little bit of intelligence or sometimes habit forming having taken care of intellectual activity of the body itself where it takes, has taken over by itself functioning as if it has a little bit of an intellect also that becomes subjective. So it is all so difficult that if I say yes to fact that as the statement of a fact which exists physically and I can see, that then if I could understand that what exists only without any interpretation could become for me an objective fact. An illustration of course of Objectivity as we know it sometimes is - you cannot use the idea of a judge being Objective. He has to be Objective of course, whenever he pronounces a sentence and he has to consider all the different factors and he hopes that then he becomes objective when he weighs the different factors for and against so that they then could become - could become in equilibrium for him to have an account of which he will pronounce the sentence. But it is not objectivity because when he pronounces it he certainly becomes identified with whatever the criminal has done and he feels that he has to be punished. So even in that case we don't know what objectivity means. If I say I want to sleep about certain things in order to form an opinion which is more seasoned after having thought about it I will be able to be more objective, of course it isn't true either because when I start to think about it from different angles, gradually that what I have to think about takes on a certain value which again becomes regarding my own opinions more in equilibrium. And that the judgement simply when I say it is more objective, it only means that I have considered all the possible factors that could influence it and then I have to come to a conclusion hoping that I haven't forgotten any other fact that later on perhaps I might have to think about. As far as objectivity in the

outside world is concerned, that is something that is not immediately connected with ourselves, it is probably a little easier to see how objectivity can actually be registered in ourselves when we are not concerned so much with it or at times ^{that} we are concerned, but also then we can verify an objective fact with that what is a subjective interpretation. The best example for that is the research of a scientific man who because of his science has to be objective and because of his love of himself and the way he wants to carry on his research probably is very subjective. You remember I have given the example several times of certain chemical substances which according to a scientist have, have a certain boiling point, that is according to his theory it has to be a certain temperature and that when he verifies it and actually determines it the boiling point is different. And then he is faced with the problem what is right, particularly when he has a theory for which he is known and his name is attached to, it is very difficult for a man of that kind to have enough character to admit that he has made a mistake or at least that his theory was not entirely right. And the objective fact remains that the boiling point was actually as it has been determined. Now we know that it becomes more and more objective if this particular fact is also verified by a great number of people. So the more people are involved, stating the ~~same~~ thing, the more objective a certain ~~xxx~~ statement becomes. And this is true in general. If I apply it in the field of art, the more people are affected by a painting, or by any form of art, in the same way, the more reason there is to assume that it has more objectivity in it, and that ultimately that what is objective art has to be recognized by everybody without exception as such a piece of art which affects them, because a person who looks at a painting of course is dependent upon his own personal interpretation. So therefore

you cannot immediately say that if I agree in the description of it or the effect it has on me that that would make it objective or less objective if there is a different kind of a description. That what counts in a, in a consideration like that, is when it has an effect on me. That is if I am emotionally attracted because it is art so it has to be aesthetic, of an aesthetic value - and then when I am emotionally affected by it it becomes a piece of art and therefore an objective form of art cannot leave anyone cold. You might say it is an extreme case, but in any event it illustrates it, that the totality of the different people who view it - will - if they can agree on the one point of being affected emotionally - also state the facts ~~xxxx xxxx~~ of that becoming ~~an objectivum~~ for them ~~an~~ a piece of objective art. The same is true with philosophy and the same is true with religion. An objective God is acknowledged by everyone as a higher form of being. And as long as there is still a difference of opinion about the higher levels of beings in general and that what may be his endlessness, that kind of a religion is never objective. Of course we know it well enough that practically all religions are utterly subjective and that the images and the definitions, all the different ways by which one describes, even religions feelings, naturally remain completely subjective in a person. In philosophy it is even worse because no one can agree. And it even is considered a very good thing if so-called becomes original. The more original the farther it is removed from objectivity.

Now, what other questions? The law of seven? Octave law and the law of three? Do we understand it all the same way? Do we know what is meant by the intervals? The DO RE MI, the triad of a DO RE MI, FA one and a half note separated from SOL, SI-DO half a note? How

did it come about? Why shouldn't the se intervals all be equal? That is a logical stepping-stone, you might say. If you read purgatory it probably will be very much more confused after you have read it. And still in that there is the explanation because when he talks about stopinders he talks about the moving of that. You see the SOL LA SI as a triad has been moved towards the DO and as a result the FA was lengthened to one and a half. And the SI DO was shortened to half a note. The result of that is that in the one and a half there is much more space and less density and the reverse is true between the SI DO where there is less space and more density. So you have the different bridges. You might say, the two bridges which are in an octave and which were introduced in order to make an octave dependent on another octave so that the totality of all events became related to each other and that none would stand on it's own. And that this would insure continuity of a certain way which expressed in the terms of the evolution and the involution would decide for oneself to, at the level where we are at the present time and in our own mind, and what it can really contain, that for that reason it was necessary to express it in a certain way and that therefore this shifting of the SOL LA SI was necessary in order to bring about a uniformity between the different laws and octaves as they existed. But that because of the change of density in the one and a half note as compared to the density of the half note, the character of the bridges that is the difficulties of over-brdgng to go from MI to SOL for instance or to go from SI to DO or reversely, involutionarily to go from DO to SI or from SOL to MI of course must mean that there is a different approach necessary in order to overbridge one or the other. If it is SI DO it is obvious that when it is more concentrated there is much more necessity of really dissolving it in ~~such a way that the f~~

that are inside disappear. Whereas when it is in the FA state and there it is of less density, it is necessary to have an extra amount of energy to over-bridge that particular gap and therefore we talk about an outside shock and an inner shock. The inner shock is SI DO. The outside is at FA. Now to illustrate this outside shock. Is it actually something that comes from the outside? Or is it there that by means of another octave a certain form of energy becomes available which helps the original octave in its particular progress from MI to SOL to overbridge FA and that because of that when it is affected by the out, the other octave it looks as if it is an outside shock? Well that is very much like waiting for something to come around until it will give you a shock. And in the process of the development of man that of course never takes place. So there has to be another kind of an explanation for it. The totality of a scale in accordance with a cosmic ray or in accordance with an ordinary octave going from ~~DO~~ to ~~SI~~ and ~~not~~ reaching DO because that would be the end of that octave and everything would be finished. So, going from DO, the lower DO, to SI has to have it in this FA and the SI DO. And whenever one reaches the state MI, that is from DO RE MI and would get ready to ^{try to} overbridge the FA bridge then it is necessary to remember that the whole octave totally belongs together as one and that really the law of Seven contains in it ~~the~~ law of three, as indicated by the DO and FA and SI DO as the three cardinal points of that particular kind of progress. And that usually we don't see it because the Law of Seven is the law of phenomena and the law of three ~~is~~ the law of numena. That means that whatever is back of what is a phenomena that what really is invisible to us is really the motivating force which makes the Law of Seven operate in our world as a Law of Seven and in the numenal world as a law of three. So therefore the relationship between DO -

- the initial starting point - the FA when the first difficulty has to be overcome - and the SI DO when finally a solution has to be made the relationships now have to be DO, FA and SI DO. And in order to overbridge FA I have to realize that Si Do at the end is really the ending of my octave and that therefore the consideration of the difficulties of finally reaching freedom because that is what SI DO means when it is more and more bound because of the increased pressure that because of this consideration at the point MI when I now consider that SI DO also has to be followed up afterwards in order to complete the octave MI is creating its own surrounding a certain state partly you might say of anticipation and because of this that what seems accidental now takes place in a more accidental way and for that reason the influence looks as if it comes from the outside in the form of a shock which I then utilize in order to get over FA. In reality it has come from the inner consideration of SI DO. Sometimes we will distinguish between the inner shock and the outer but the inner shock is very necessary in order, ~~know~~ with the Do the initial starting point, to come to the place where SI DO helps DO reinforcing it in creating then a condition as if an outside shock helps me to overbridge the FA one and a half note.

Question of Time. What is time? Measurement of what? Space, movement of one point from one place to another. I say it takes time. If movement in space for me between two points is indicated by a linear, a line, a linear direction - I call it a first dimension as far as space is concerned. And at times that it is consumed I call the first dimension of time. It is absolutely parallel to each other. And when we talk about the second and the third dimension of space it also has

its counterpart in the second and third dimension of time. So that really there are six concepts, three of one kind belonging to space, the other three belonging to a time concept which again is dependent on the movement of something in space. The second dimension that I call a dimension in space has of course to do with the movement of a line in a plane which is in accordance with a line not in the direction of the original line. The movement of any line not in its own direction, but with an angle, will describe a space of a certain surface which is two-dimensional. That what takes place in time is the movement of a time line as an, a certain time elapsing between two points. in a space which is now not in the same direction as the original time dimension. It describes then a plane of time. The movement of a plane in space will create a third dimension. The movement of a plane in time creates the third dimension of time. What is meant by that ? The ~~xxxxxx~~ first one, dimension in space, I call length, the second width, the third height. In time that what I call the duration of time is simply ~~the~~ length of time as measured by certain instruments and ultimately measured by the way the earth travels around the sun, that is as far as our own solar system is concerned our measure of time. The second dimension of time, the movement of a line in space of time, is that at any one point all times, as experienced by every person, is then noticed and becomes a, a certain plane of time, the totality of all men having time as an experience. The third dimension of time is the realization of all time as has been experienced by each person from the earliest moments of his conception to the moment of his death or up to the time he is, he is considering this particular question. This implies of course that at any one time each person has his own time as experience and that his time dies with him. For that reason Gurdjieff says that

it becomes unique subjective, because there is nothing of my time or anyone else's time that can be compared and only in the use of the word time. And that I describe my time again in comparing it to something that I believe has a certain time because it seems like a recurrence of certain events which are spaced together in a certain time length between two points which are similar, that is, if the earth turns around the sun, the seasons indicate for me the time and also as far as space is concerned the stars or the sun itself indicate as seen from the earth a certain place which again recurs after a certain length of time.

Now the question of a moment. If I divide time as I know it into different sections and I say there well is a year, so many days the sun going up and down, dark and light, a day I say 24 hours, 12 on an average light, 12 on an average dark. It means of course that there as certain as I call them hours, I call them 24, 12, whatever, indicated probably by the Zodiac or wherever this particular figure 12 came from. It is still too big for me to fathom it, so I will divide an hour into 60 minutes and then again this 60 minutes each minute becomes a second. Now where does a moment come in? You see it is not a second and it is not even a short length of time. A moment is only a point. No more. And it can only be conceived by a person, that is he can have an experience of a moment when he has in him an instrument which is also nondimensional. In other words, a moment belongs to the objective world. All other ideas of time belong to the subjective world. And when I say simultaneity, simultaneousness, simultaneity, it means that I have to have a concept of a moment which moment again when I want to bring it down to earth, has to be registered and that registration has to be instantaneous. So I use words now that have an objective value in the midst of subjective concepts. And

difficult to experience them because immediately whenever I experience anything I will want to put it in a word and as soon as it is in a word time has elapsed and also I have chosen a form which becomes dimensional. So you see the description, or even a feeling of that what is now taking place as an object for me never is objective as long as I try want to describe it in anyform whatsoever, of I want to indicate that I have felt it. And perhaps the closest I get to the idea of objectivity is when I realize the moment of intuition which for me does not require any particular word and only a statement to myself that there is all of a sudden - this is a moment all of a sudden something registers in me which I consider knowledge. That is, a fact.

Now, what other concepts?

Mike Warren: I didn't understand when you were talking about objectivity. It seemed to be that objectivity required everyone's belief, that is...

Mr. Nyland: Did you hear what I said about any kind of a form of expression of a personality remains subjective? A belief undoubtedly is subjective. If I could have a statement from God as non-existing for me and only indicating certain things that become for me acknowledged, then it is not a belief, but it could become an objective expression from God to me. Aside from that, however, whenever I am subject to anything that comes from above that could be objective I would have to translate it into a terminology that becomes subjective for me. Try to think about it because it is not so easy. We always get stuck on the idea of objectivity, always because we want to describe it and objectivity can never be described. As I said a little while ago, it cannot even be felt. But let's say that is a lot of theory. Yeah.

Steve Joseph: The concept of paying for my arising and my individuality -what's involved in that?

Mr. Nyland: Well, one finds oneself on earth as a result of a certain action between father and mother. There is a certain form of life that is put in me and it has taken on a particular form and I call it a human being by my name. Because of this kind of fact, now being - you might say - produced as a manifestation on earth. I am now simply set in motion and by being furnished with a breathing apparatus and taking in air, I keep growing, again with food provided by someone who is wiser than I am at the moment when I was born that I don't know very much in the first place, those who are well meaning and give me a little food until finally I will earn enough of that kind of a material to build myself enough up so that by then in turn can earn my living in the world. Now to pay for the arising has to do with the fact that for some reason or another I find myself on earth capable of doing certain things and particularly when I have in mind that that what is my life may have different kind of meaning than just being born on earth and living and dying. And if I start to realize that by having this body the way it is I also have a means to work with it and develop something else which ultimately could free me from the bondage of earth, then I appreciated that which has been given to me as a tool, and for that reason I will take on the responsibility not only maintaining it in the way it is but to pay for the existence because for me it has become a workshop where I now want to make something that I, in the Gurdjieffian term, would call a Kestdjanian soul. So you see I pay as it were for that what is my equipment. I will not pay for it when I don't see it as equipment. As long as I see it as an ordinary formation on earth, all I have to do is be grateful for my father and mother.

even if I am not happy on earth I can curse them. And say why was I born? But I will never consider the necessity that I have to pay for my existence. As a matter of fact I would go the other way, and say they have to pay me for keeping me alive! It is only when the body as it is, or a human being as he is, being equiped and having grown, grown up sufficiently having come to a point of his physical maturity and perhaps as far as his development is concerned either emotionally or intellectually up to a point where he has a feeling center and he has something that he calls his mind, that only for the reason that he could consider this a means to another end he will feel responsible that he has to pay for it. You see? But otherwise the question does not come up. I simply assume that mother nature wanted me here and that I am fulfilling my task by eating, drinking, and sleeping and dying. Responsibility only comes when that what I am on earth is considered as a stepping-stone towards another personality. As I say, if it is not there I remain unconscious and in an unconscious state I don't pay.

Steve Joseph: Does payment consist of payments to work? To wake up?

Mr. Nyland: No, I don't think it is that. I think the payment is made by that what could function independently of the physical body. So that in the form of freedom I give back to the earth what belongs to the earth. This is how I pay. I pay to myself whenever I work but I make out of my work something that is useful to me. That is if it could become Kesdjanian or soul. I, you might say, profit by that. And having now made this, or created it, I feel under obligation of paying. But you see the work on myself was for me. Only that what I have made will have the responsibility for the payment to mother nature. And I pay by means of loosening the bondage which now binds me to earth, by myself instead of having mother nature do it. You understand that, that is I

wish. Almost if you make a picture as if mother nature is an undertaker.

Elton Hay: In conjunction with this would you say something on Partkdolg-duty.

Mr. Nyland: Well, it is a duty. That is that kind of an obligation which man has to himself, also this question of payment comes in, that why should he be responsible for that which he was not responsible at all? And man never is responsible for his own birth, the responsibility rests in the first place with his father and mother and if they undertook to create a new creature. That creature finds itself at a certain time on earth the way it is and in that particular state bound by the body. Although it represents life it is now life on earth encased in a certain form belonging to earth. Now the duty that man has as soon as he becomes responsible and understands that his form of his life is different from what he has always assumed it to be, that is his assumption has been that he found ~~xxxx~~ himself as a child of his father and mother and responsible in the first place to that what they had done to him, helping to educate and build him up sufficiently so that he could stand on his own two feet and that his responsibility in the first place has to be discharged towards his father and mother, or perhaps even to nearest relatives or in some way or other that he was grateful to have had the opportunity for growing up. Partkdolg-duty comes in now that he has to partake in his life. That is, that he, knowing that his life has been automatically what it is, he now will want to take over and direct his life in his way in order to create for himself the ~~xxxx~~ possibility of becoming free from it. And this becomes his duty because with his realization that he has a life of himself for which he was not primarily responsible, he's willing to take the responsibility

now on himself in the creation of something for himself in order to become free. So you might say that Partkdalg duty goes against the original concept of a man being born. And for that reason that man when he is born has already in him a desire to become free and to die. And that the idea of death already starts at the moment of conception. You might also say that if life exists why should it exist in different parts or sections separated from the totality of all life? Why should life be represented in certain forms when there is no necessity for life to have a form in order to be vital? You see it has to do with what I understand, or how I understand, the concept of life. Life for me as I see it in the forms of human beings or animals or plants always is linked up with that what is the form. And I really don't know anything about life existing by itself. You remember some time ago I was here I talked about life before birth, life before conception. That at that, at that time, at that period, and I mentioned sperm and ova, that at that time it existed in freedom before there was any joining, life was then free to be done with whatever one wishes. And it did not have then a form and only that what was carrying it as life as a cell. But as soon as there was a conception, that then life got bound and that later in the life-time an opportunity should be given to that form of life as now represented by man to free himself from that kind of, I call it sometimes a mistake. And that he could wish for his own death as soon as possible, at least the physical death, so that the continuation of life in him could continue in a different form and with more freedom. And that therefore the idea of Kesdjan existing simply means that life continues for man but this time in a form which is not as much a form as his physical body. And that he has difficulties in freeing himself in having gone up one step in the development on the Kesdjanian level, has been made, let's say, easier for man. That is, if he, as Kesdjan, still exists in that kind of a form of spiritual existence or a different kind of a world, ~~which we don't know~~.

by means of extrasensory perception. That certain things at that particular level of life will take place and also are bound by a certain time length in which, during which time Kessdjanian body has to develop and assists, and again Kessdjan will die after a certain period of time has elapsed. So man's Partkdalg duty extends in the first place during his lifetime as long as he is in the body and it will continue as long as that part of life represented by him is still encased in Kessdjan. And that only the duty as such will cease to exist when man has made a soul which soul if sufficiently developed is free from all bondage of this particular solar system in which mankind happened to be born. You see, in that way considering it a responsibility one becomes in taking this responsibility on one's shoulders a part of the totality of everything existing and then hastening for oneself the possibility of being released from the bondage of earth in the first place, and bondage of Kessdjan in the second. So that the state of soul, if man reaches that, and it has to be man number seven, when he is there then he can truly offer himself in the service of the Lord, as it were. The fourth and fifth Rule of Objective Morality to help His Endlessness to lighten His burden of the maintenance, maintenance, maintaining level and you might say the, the different conditions of regulations of the universe and then undertake for the sake of those who are similarly constituted as he is, the possibility of advising them how to free themselves from the bondage of earth. These are the fourth and fifth, all of that belongs to Partkdalg duty.

Now, what other things are there that we can talk about? I am trying to think of what I remember of the discussions you have made. Many of your discussions are a little bit hair-splitting. They really are not important. If you listen to one of the tapes from a meeting that I talked about recently I think it was some, sometime last week. In

which I said that --- eh, I think it was Besten --- there are no questions. The answers to questions are not important. There is only one question that has to be answered and it is always answered with work. On your work. That will answer in time all questions. There is no other question that is important because it doesn't help you as long as you keep on talking about it. And even the best of explanations, even the different things we just now discussed of definitions of certain terminology is not work in the strict sense of the word. Reading is not work. Discussions among you and among us everywhere as meetings is not work. And much too much time is usually spent in talking about it instead of working. And that it is only really legitimate to talk about the experiences of the application of certain facts when you try to wake up. And the only question that should be answered is how much of an attempt did you make in waking up. That is all that counts. All the rest does not count, not as far as work is concerned. It does not count to the extent that it gives you stimulus. But, you know, all these kinds of discussions and everything that you want to be explained first, or that you think it is necessary to understand the hydrogen tables or the enneagram and so forth before you can start working. Of course it is utter nonsense. Nobody at the present time in this room or in many other meetings we have had has any excuse, of not knowing in the first place what work is, and what his responsibility is when he hears about it. If he has heard what is work and he pretends that he is interested in Gurdjieff, and there is only one thing to do, that is to make attempts to wake up. And if you don't do that, you fiddle around much too much by substituting something that keeps you very nicely busy and gives you an enjoyment in your head and sometimes in your heart, and you sometimes will say how lovely this and that, and it does not buy you any bread whatsoever. To some extent all talk is stupidity. It is empty.

Because a little bit of that what is needed as far as the exchange of ideas and even that defining certain terminology in the exact language which is needed for that, for the continuation of an understanding and communication of that kind of a language, all of that is like salt, which will season that what is work. And too much salt, you know, ultimately becomes poison. It is extremely difficult to know how much salt is really needed in order to make certain kinds of food palatable. And when the food is represented by the wish to work, real wish, a real wish to wake up, a real desire to use whatever knowledge one has for the sake of becoming conscious. And conscious in the real sense of the word as Gurdjieff means it, of the acquisition of that what can start to function intellectually in an objective sense, and to have this consciousness extend further in the ability to create a conscience in one's heart and because of the combination of the two, consciousness and conscience, that then in man can be formed a will of his own belonging then to man as an individual. All of that is implied in work on oneself and that is the food that we eat. That is the kind of life-giving force for the building of that what is at the present time potential and should be built, and we call it Kessdjanian or we call it soul. For that one has to have a taste, and this taste for each personality is helped by a certain quantity of salt and it is not always the same quantity for each person, because the taste is different for each person, the way of digesting is different, and the way they bring to it their own stomach or their own psyche, in that particular form of their education or whatever they have been brought up with, will enable them at a certain time to digest. But not for each person in the same way, and for that reason the seasoning of their food has to be every once in a while a little different for different people. So, if you put it down to earth a little more, it is really necessary for some people to have a little bit more theory than others and for some

people almost any kind of theory is already deleterious and, you might say, it makes the food too salty. They have to have a different kind of salt. I don't want to distinguish salt as represented by one's mind and salt as represented by one's feelings. You can say one has a little taste; the other will give you food more palatable because of its condition as it is not dependent on taste. Let's say it this way: for that what is necessary for food to be digested it has to be at the right kind of a temperature. If it is too cold it doesn't digest so well. If it is much too cold it cools the stomach off like cold ice-water will do that and make the stomach unable even to digest at all. That what is needed for some people is a heart quality, that what is warmth, that is the condition of the food which is then given to some persons who don't want theory in order for them to digest it and it is made palatable by means of the way it is expressed. These you might say are the two ingredients that are necessary and I call them both salt as a certain necessary ingredient but not too much and not too little. Now I think that the theoretical discussions that we usually have very often are much too much salt. And that they will give you also indigestion that after a little while you will set up in yourself a desire to have more and more theory. You see? It really means this, that because of that you get thirsty and you thirst for water and not for food. And then you start to dilute the ideas so that you do not get the ideas as such in a concentrated form where they will do most good, but in a diluted form in order to make it a little bit more digestible to you because your condition is already bad. This is always the danger regarding food of this kind, that we make it a little bit more palatable for a variety of people who don't want to work. They want to have something that temporarily gives them a little idea and a glimpse of what might be meant and with that in mind one starts to dilute the ideas a little bit

and gradually starts to introduce certain concepts that don't belong there at all. And that for instance this question of objectivity and awareness and being awake is then gradually gone over in the direction or rather is spoiled by letting it go in the direction of a certain form of mental or even emotional quality. And that then in order to you might say to justify that, the reason given that if one only has a certain intellectual or emotional something that is of such high quality that it becomes extremely rare and very seldom occurs, that then because of that it becomes objective. This is of course extremely difficult where to draw the line and in the beginning it is absolutely necessary to draw the line very sharply between objectivity and subjectivity. And that later on one can allow certain forms which ~~xx~~ are extremely purified because of suffering in life, usually with persons who have lived and lived through a variety of different conditions that gradually their mind and their feeling become, you might almost call it rarified, and then reach a certain point very close to objectivity. And that it is ~~is~~ not up to us to say that they are ~~is~~ not objective at that point. You know, I've said this about artists, about certain scientists, about certain people who have lived, those who have developed intellectually or emotionally and also those who have been developed in a physical sense, and then we use that beautiful word - obyvatel - for them. To indicate that man has acquired a dexterity which is quite exceptional and which probably has gone ~~at~~ at the expense of losing many other of his qualities but in this one direction in which he excels, which is his trade, his stock in trade no one can tell him any different or better and no one - even God himself - could improve on - let's say a man who knows how to make shoes extremely well. Such people I say are extremely rare and one must not put ~~xx~~ any particular water in the ~~x~~ wine hoping that if I start to ~~is~~ purify a little bit of my feelings that because of that I will become objective. There is nothing of the kind that really will take way of it.

place, and you may as well know it because you usually think that by means of artistic productions and usually that what I consider in an artistic production impossible to achieve - that that for me always remains elusive, that that I would call objective.

In the first place it never exists and only in my mind - it is not as yet created and in the second place when it is created it will have taken on a form which is dependent on my subjective thinking or feeling. Now sometimes again one introduces a little element and then in effect order to put it on a better - in a better place - or perhaps on a better kind of a level, that I will say - yes, but this that what is produced now is God inspired and I hope then that that what is my word of art is not really me but that what is really represented as art is God smiling on me and becoming so fond of me that it comes out through work on my production of art as a creation. I think much of that is utter nonsense. It remains always an artist who has to produce it and if he can not produce it, he just cannot produce it. And there are many things that one thinks about and wishes for which ultimately are impossible to put in any kind of a form and I think this is really a sign of a true artist - not to be able to catch that what he really feels or really thinks. And that he always will be up against it because in all the conditions of life ~~someday~~ each person is up against a particular limit above which he cannot go. And this applies to art as well as to any other kind of an activity. My height, how tall I am, is limited by my body. And I cannot help it at all. I cannot do anything to it. I can stand on my toes! I can outstretch my hands, my arms; I can reach to the highest shelf and that's it and no more. With my feeling I come to a point where I know I cannot do more, even if I wish with the best of intentions. And of course the same thing I know with my mind is absolutely limited to a certain way of thinking and I cannot add any more facts in it.

it crowds itself out and then I have to use all kinds of other little bits of tricks in order to help clarify it and with that for instance I use drugs in order to see if I can make my mind function a little better. Of course what takes place in that particular instance I simply widen it a little bit or I make it a little looser or I reduce some of the functions a little bit, practically to nothing, so that some of what is left comes to the foreground. I then recall it. It is memory for me, and sometimes quite enjoyable. It gives me a state of lightness and something that I would like to have every once in a while and at the same time it is extremely diliterious.

Someday I will have to talk to you about drugs because here on the west coast you are really very very superficial about it. And the way it is sometimes talked about, it ~~as~~ is as if it is not doing any harm whatsoever. It is utter stupidity to think that. And that it will give you any kind of a condition of consciousness in the sense of Gurdjieff you have to be quite clear that it is nothing at all that can be compared. There is no effect like ~~such~~ Gurdjieffian consciousness in any form of a drug or anything you take. Someday if you wish I will talk much more in detail but it is some, something that is such a danger that we simply take in because we don't know any better and that a - more or less it is a little bit of a fad and because also temporarily it gives you a little relief. But so does a laxative and so does alcohol and so does a smoke or a drink at the proper time and so do ~~many~~ many things relieve you naturally in a certain way. And of course all these kind of things like drugs or chemical, everything that you want to use for your body - of course it will have an effect. There is not question about an effect, no question about that it is sometimes very enjoyable. The only damn trouble with the whole thing is that there is no possibility of developing any "I" whatsoever - and that there is nobody "you" that has been, so that even if you work it's still I.e.

you have that kind of a state, you don't know what to do with it.

Aside from the deleterious effects on you, that you put in yourself poison, that the body does not know how to get rid of it because these are new forms of chemicals which do not belong to the natural body at all. They are synthetically made and they don't belong to the organic Kingdom. And your body is an organic instrument and it can have antitoxins; it can produce certain things in order to offset that what threatens it. A body can produce an antipoison when something is taken in as a poison immediately the body will try to form antibodies to neutralize the poison. Whenever you have a wound, immediately your wound starts to coagulate the blood in order to protect it and to protect from more blood going out and also to prevent anything from coming in that might dirty it or impurify it. So the body is used to that and within certain limits it is a marvelous instrument because it does it and that immediately when something is introduced there is the body threatened and of course will want to put something in it in order to counteract that what is a stranger and that takes then energy from the body away from certain functions which have to be fulfilled. And they are not fulfilled sufficiently. The body also knows this and that there are other functions that are set into motion in order to offset that what is the deficiency of material that should have been used for normal purposes which now have to be used for that what - let's say the elimination of something that has come in without any rhyme or reason. This can go on for just a little while and then the body gets sick and tired of it and then it starts to have a certain effect on the body which sometimes can be - can become permanent. And nobody knows exactly where this is. And I am not talking about habit forming because that already is so idiotic because you become so dependent on something on the outside that has nothing to do with you anymore. And anything that you don't pay for you are not entitled to.

An "I" has to be worked for and earned. And when it is earned then it is earned and it has a value. Anything you rely on like going and running to the doctor because you ~~know~~ have a little pain in your stomach - of course you become dependent on the advice or a little pill of some kind or other. Whenever you put your faith in that kind of thing, even if you put your faith in God and it is necessary to pray in order to be alleviated from this and that - it's all nonsense. Either you pray to something that is your own and that you can rely on, that you have made, and when you have made it with the sweat of your brow, by really going against certain difficulties in order to overcome by means of that friction and building something - I say it is your own - you can start relying on it because that will help you. It is your own. A doctor won't help. A little bit - yes - If you have a scratch he can give you some salve. I'm not saying anything against the medical profession, don't misunderstand me. It is something you have to build for yourself if you really want to become a man. And you don't get it by running to the doctor or the pharmacy.

Now as far as drugs are concerned, when this effect on your body is so strong that it cannot so easily be eliminated, it will do damage to the ~~to~~ total structure of your body. And this you will not know because for a little while it is supplied by other material which you do not know where it comes from and of course reduces the functions of the body as a whole. And only after ~~now~~ sometime you will discover in quite a different kind of a (field) that you are not as - let's say easy - or that you become a little more irritable, that you fly off the handle easier or that your digestions are not always so good, or your sleep has been reduced a little bit or you don't ~~think~~ think so clearly any more. And that you constantly, because of this and particularly the last one, you will be driven time and time again to go to the doctor and take another pill. And that is such utter stupidity of

man that he feels that he can get away with it. And ultimately he will not get away with it and anyone who is taking it, please look at those who take it. If you are not stupid you will see what they are and you really - you must come to a conclusion that they are not normal people. That where it registers very often is their eyes. They are overbright. And they burn out too fast. And at times when they are not under the influence they are really practically no color whatsoever. Look at it - look at how their different eyes are formed, how around an eye the little muscles become either flabby or tense. The general deportment of such people. I don't want to mention names; you can fill it in yourself. You can look at it. But for heaven's sake see what you have, what you want, would be doing and to rely on it just for a little moment of a little extra satisfaction which, as you know, is not permanent at all and only gives you a little satisfaction because for some reason or other this so-called expanding little universe of your brain is helping you a little bit to have thoughts you haven't thought about before and also eliminates certain thoughts that you don't really like. Well, some day we'll talk more about that.

What other things are there regarding work? Concepts for your work, what is in your way, what are obstacles, what are your habits, your tendencies, traits of character, acquired characteristics, what are the things that keep you asleep. Why is it that when you have a wish that you cannot even fulfill it? Simply because in ordinary life you don't do it. Our "Ordinary life." Where is a person who keeps his word? Who is a person who does not tell any lies? Not even by implication? Who is a person who is not vain, who doesn't love himself so much that he will do it at the expense of someone else? Who really has pity - real pity? Who really is wishing to sacrifice himself for the sake of someone else without gaining anything. Who is a person who indiscriminately loves

people, never mind if they are old or young or whatever their condition is, who can in that way imitate the sun who shines on evil and good?

We as human beings - we think we can work and our ordinary affairs are not at all put in order. That is where it starts. That is - I call it many times the preparation for work. To become an ordinary kind of a man in ordinary life. Reliable and fulfilling the functions as represented by the different relationships that he has and to work for that and really want to do it right and to become - again I say in that sense - a man. Not a man with a capital M - probably - not a man conscious or a man who is really harmonious. Forget about it for quite some time. Look at the junk that you leave behind you, that you don't even clean up. Or that you are too fussy and you clean up too much and you lose your time that way. Laziness. All of us are ~~lax~~ lazy. Attached to the bed, wanting to sleep, and if you can't sleep then a little tranquilizer and your thoughts sometimes go around and around filled with jealousy, nonsense, TV, excitement of a western story with boom boom boom and all that. This is our life. This is the stupidity. This is ~~what~~ what you are constantly affected by whenever you open a newspaper - whenever you hear about Viet Nam - whenever you dislike Johnson very much or any of the politicians or any of the junk that is now presented so-called as what - art? Or even science? Publication after publication, nonsensical book after nonsensical book with a lot of new coined words that don't mean anything whatsoever. Where are simple people? We in this complicated life, poisoned by carbon monoxide and sulphur in the air. Smog. Nothing is done. Why? Where are our real men - statesmen - you know - not politicians? Statesmen - really mean like we used to have once in a while. Those who remember Borak for instance, Wilke, where are they? A lot of nonsensical professors. Again I have nothing to say about science. And little to say about politics. I am not interested in politics either. But I am talking about what I think is important.

ordinary life as we have to live it and that is where it starts.

What do we do with our ordinary life? In our simple relationships in that what we claim when we say I love you - do we? For what? For what sake? On what level? Where? Love? Sex? Try to remember if you can yourself sometimes maybe how you used to be. How you were when you were quite young. Or look at little ~~xx~~ children and see what they are. Uninhibited. Not spoiled. And we with all kind of coats of protection around us and no one can pierce through and no one can even see; we cannot. It is not transparent, neither translucent. It is not open; we are not open. We don't know how it is to be open. To be interested in a variety of things that happen around us and whenever it happens we already have an opinion and that closes us up again. To open for everything that happens - that is life. When you really can display that - when you know that there is something that is still, that has a possibility of making you really - hoping, believing, saying, marvelous this - that; I don't care if it ~~x~~ is right or wrong but at least it is a ^{out} form of life in you that has to come/every once in a while... As if you sometimes wish to shout it from the housetops. You see this is the beginning of work. And when you are not really qualified and in an ordinary sense then I & really don't think that you already have the capacity of building something of such finer nature, such less density, such high kind of a quality as a Kestjianian body when you don't even know what feelings and emotions are in ordinary life - when you constantly mix them up with the desire of the body. And that as far as your intellect is concerned, you know how often it is just murmuring, saying a few things and trying to get away with it in order to create an impression on someone else - that someone else will tell you how marvelous you are.

These are the ordinary things and while for them first and begin with them - to succeed so that they can be transformed into something else. If you make up your

mind to get up, get up. If you don't want to sleep too much, don't sleep too much. If you say that you eat too much, don't do it. But don't keep on saying that you should not eat candy or whatever.

Now - we work now. You know work. You know what is meant. There ought to be enough clarity so that now I can ask you that tomorrow you are going to work. And if tomorrow night - do we meet tomorrow night? What is today? Sunday. Do we meet tomorrow? (Ron: We hadn't planned a meeting tomorrow.) Well if you want to meet let me know and then you can talk about your difficulties tomorrow. That you really attempt. I gave a task in New York in leaving and I said I would be away for three weeks which will be approximately it. And the first week not to do anything in particular but the same way what they ever had done regarding work. The second week to consider themselves completely free in not doing anything at all, nothing as far as work is concerned, as if they never heard of work and then to see what happens; where is their desire to continue and if they didn't have it not to work, not to do, not to read, not even to discuss. And the third week to make it such a concentrated work week; everytime, everyday, whenever they happened to think about it to see if at that time the thought or the feeling could be converted into the actuality of really wishing to wake up. That third week of course - that will count. They will not be able to do it, I know, naturally, because it is not in them sufficiently and still the attempt has to be made. So when I say tomorrow if you wish to work, you work in accordance with your ability, whatever your level of being is that will allow it, and then we can talk about it tomorrow. Yeah?

Kathy Differding: If you remember and wan to try to work - what's the first that you would do - just say -

Mr. Nyquist: I would